

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14, 17-22, 25-30, and 33-36 are pending in the present application.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-7, 12-14, 17-29, and 31-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sampson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,624, hereinafter Sampson) in view of Beaumont et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0085918, hereinafter Beaumont); and Claims 8-11 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092, hereinafter Ferguson).

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 as unpatentable over Sampson in view of Beaumont, Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a first server system having...an updating unit configured to carry out a remote updating of contents of inherited pages which present at least part of contents or a framework of the main site an inherited from the first server system at the second server system, at prescribed timing when the authentication succeeds; and the second server system having...an inherited page unit configured to maintain the inherited pages; and an original page unit configured to maintain original pages of the partner site.”

These noted elements of Claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by Sampson. The outstanding Office Action relies on Beaumont to disclose these elements of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Beaumont does not cure the deficiencies in Sampson.

The outstanding Office Action takes the position that Beaumont discloses the claimed “updating unit” (paragraphs [0053], [0047], and [0048] of Beaumont), an inherited page (paragraph [0053] of Beaumont), and an original page (paragraph [0029] of Beaumont).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action, pages 2-5.

Applicant respectfully traverses these positions taken in the outstanding Office Action with respect to Beaumont.

Beaumont, considered as a whole, discloses that a host application merely defines a respective size and a respective location for each GUI region on a GUI display. Browsers corresponding to each GUI region retrieve and execute a web page so as to define the appearance and/or functionality of the corresponding GUI region based on the web page. Each browser is substantially independent of the host application. According to Beaumont, it is easy to define the appearance and/or the functionality of each GUI region because it is defined by a user-friendly high-level standardized language such as HTML, rather than a programming language of the host application such as C++. Beaumont also suggests that the disclosed system makes it easier to modify the appearance and/or the functionality of each GUI region.

The outstanding Office Action does not clearly indicate which elements in Beaumont are believed to correspond to the updating unit, the inherited page, and the original page.

Judging from the statements made in the outstanding Office Action, the PTO seems to be taking the position that the independence of the browser from the host application in Beaumont is relevant to the “remote updating” of the claimed invention. In Beaumont, however, each browser does not remotely update a corresponding GUI region on a GUI display. According to the claimed invention, an updating unit of the first server system remotely updates inherited pages maintained by an inherited page unit of a second server system.

Particularly, a page itself is updated according to the claimed invention. In contrast, the appearance and/or the functionality of each GUI region is updated and a page is merely retrieved and used for the update in Beaumont.


Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Beaumont does not disclose or suggest the updating unit, inherited page, and original page as claimed.

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 (and any claims dependent thereon) patentably distinguishes over Sampson and Beaumont, taken alone or in proper combination. Independent Claims 18, 25, and 33-36 recite elements that are analogous to those of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 18, 25, and 33-36 (and any claims dependent thereon) patentably distinguish over Sampson and Beaumont, taken alone or in proper combination, for at least the reasons stated for Claim 1.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Joseph Wrkich  
Registration No. 53,796